

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 254 048

EC 172 009

AUTHOR Lorieau, Paulette M.
TITLE Parenting the Gifted: Literature and Research.
PUB DATE 15 Dec 84
NOTE 44p.
PUB TYPE Reference Materials - Bibliographies (131)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Annotated Bibliographies; *Child Rearing; Elementary
Secondary Education; *Gifted; Parent Materials;
*Parent Role

ABSTRACT

The bibliography presents annotations for approximately 80 references (1972-1983) on parenting gifted children. The references were chosen either because they presented a general overview of the field or because they offered thought-provoking viewpoints. Some of the research has direct implications for childrearing. Citations are arranged alphabetically by author's last name and include title, source, date and pagination information along with a brief summary. (CL)

* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *

ED254048

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)

- ☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
- ☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
- Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

Parenting the Gifted: Literature and Research.

Paulette M. Lorieau

December 15, 1984

McGill University, 3700 McTavish, Montreal, P.Q., Canada.

McGill Giftedness Centre
Faculty of Education
McGill University
Montreal

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS
MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Paulette
Lorieau

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES
INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

EC 17 2009

Introduction

Parents indicate a desire for information on raising their gifted children, yet may not have the time to read through the literature, finding topics of interest. The books and articles included in this bibliography have been chosen either because they give a good general overview of the field or offer thought-provoking viewpoints. Some of the research has direct implications for childrearing. Additional references are listed.

Albert, R. S. (1978). Observations and suggestions regarding giftedness, familial influence, and the achievement of eminence. Gifted Child Quarterly, 22(2), 201-211.

The author was inspired by the Study of Mathematically Precocious Youth to study families and how they influence eventual achievement in various fields. He cites a barrage of studies on eminent people that show family commitment to achieve and concerted effort to help the indexed child, if there is one nominated as talented in a creative field; a less creative, more competent achiever seemed to have a more conventional and harmonious family. The father was important to the son's achievement, and in famous men there seemed to be an oedipal relationship to the mother, or at least a "very special" bond. Albert explores the convergence-divergence balance needed; this allows a sweep of the eminent's field that eventually moves its borders. He notes that if this balance is not present, there is often a tendency to "pair up" with someone who provides it, though these achievers also have a capacity to work alone.

Albert, R. S. (1980a). Family positions and the attainment of eminence. Gifted Child Quarterly, 24(2), 87-95.

An article examining research in this area: families of the eminent are value oriented in that members are defined

by a role they will eventually play in the wider culture. There is a preparation for eminence. The achiever is treated differently and is highly stimulated. The special training is often given in areas of the parents' interests and aptitudes.

Albert, R. S. (1980b). Exceptionally gifted boys and their parents. Gifted Child Quarterly, 24(4), 174-179.

Albert suggests that eminence is not a matter of luck or genius. Family variables are important. He studies two groups of gifted boys and their parents. The 26 highest scorers on the 1976 Math Talent Search, and a second group of 26 southern California boys with IQs of 150 or higher. The age ranges were 11-14 years. Parents and subjects were given the California Psychological Inventory, the Loevinger Sentence Completion Test, and the Wallach-Kogan Test of Creative Potential, along with several questionnaires and interviews. The subjects were also given the Biographical Inventory of Creativity, the Allport-Vernon-Linzey Study of Values, and the Holland Vocational Preference Inventory. Parents were better educated than the norm (particularly the mothers) and had a higher socio-economic status. Among the many findings are the fact that parents' and childrens' creative abilities are positively related, confirmation that

creative performance requires a high level of intelligence, and versatility accompanies exceptional giftedness.

Barbe, W. (1978). Pleasure or pain in the gifted child's family. G/T/C, 1(1), 2-3, 38-40.

This is a philosophical article suggesting that giftedness is whatever society values at any point in time. The gifted's sensitivity to the environment may bring pleasure or pain in the family because of heightened awareness to stress and manipulative abilities. Three areas are discussed: language, knowledge, and self-concept. The first can bring pain and tantrums if the words, developmentally, come more slowly than the ideas. Knowledge can bring pain if used to flaunt or if the child decides to "play dumb" for acceptance. The alternative is knowledge for its own sake. Self-concept is delicate and can bring pain if the gifted do not know how they are different, what is expected of them because of this difference, and how they can relate to others who may not have their gifts.

Barbe, W., & Renzulli, J. (1981). Psychology and education of the gifted. New York: Irvington.

An impressive array of authorities in the field of giftedness have contributed their philosophies and

research to this book. Particular attention is paid to the identification and fostering of creativity. Concrete behaviors for both parents and teachers make it a practical handbook as well as solid documentation by "the experts": even the references after each article are exemplary.

Benbow, C. P., & Stanley, J. C. (1980). Intellectually talented students: family profiles. Gifted Child Quarterly, 24(3), 119-122.

This is a statistical analysis of the 873 participants in the 1976 Talent Search, compared to a random sample of 11th and 12th graders. They were 11 and 12 years old and scored above the 97th percentile in a standardized mathematics achievement test. The parents were highly educated, 98% of them were living, fathers had a high occupational status, and the mean number of children in the family was a little over three, as compared to the national mean of 1.7.

Bloom, B. S. (1982) The role of gifts and markers in the development of talents. Exceptional Children, 48(6), 510-522.

The top 25 people in each of six fields were studied over a period of three years: the arts (piano and sculpture), the cognitive (mathematical and neurological research),

and the psychomotor (olympic swimming and tennis) were selected. All subjects attained world class status before the age of 35. Only five were not willing to participate. The most striking finding was the active support given by the family, some teachers, and sometimes peers; not one reached eminence on his or her own. At age five to eight the child impressed parents and teachers with special traits (markers) which then affected their expectations, treatment, and teaching methods. The particular marker was usually determined by parental values and interests; for example, few girls were gifted in mathematics. It is interesting that not one was considered a prodigy by either family, teachers, or experts until the age of 10 or 12. Personality characteristics found in these people were: (1) willingness to do huge amounts of work (this was not strongly present until eight years old and was influenced by home socialization or training by teachers), (2) competitiveness (also from the home, especially where sibling rivalry was present), (3) rapid learning (usually restricted to the talent area).

Callahan, C. M., & Kauffman, J. M. (1982). Involving gifted children's parents: federal law is silent, but its assumptions apply. Exceptional Education Quarterly, 3(2), 50-55.

This article, written in reaction to law PL94-142, points out the fact that it does not apply to the gifted: it is for the handicapped. It further assumes that parents of the gifted are so themselves. The importance of the family is stated: Terman and Oden (1959) found a positive relationship between children's achievement and parents' high occupational and educational status, marital stability, and encouragement of independence. Bloom and Sosniak (1981), in their study of successful people, found that someone in the family had a personal interest in them, parents acted as role models, encouraged one area, and assumed they would succeed in it. Parental involvement with the school is declared important; tips are given to teachers for its facilitation.

Clark, B. (1979). Growing up gifted. Los Angeles: Merrill.

The author examines various theories and experiments, then synthesizes them into a whole view of learning for the gifted, where stress is placed on integrating the cognitive, intuitive, emotional, and physical. She believes that the gifted learn qualitatively and quantitatively differently. Strategies are given for developing each area and integrating it to the others. This is one of the most comprehensive books in the field; it gives an overview and all the specifics, from research

to available tests to futures study. A bible of giftedness.

Coffey, K., Ginsberg, G., Lockhart, C., McCartney, D., Nathan, C., & Wood, K. (1976). Parentspeak on gifted and talented children. Ventura, California: Ventura County Superintendent of Schools Office.

Parentspeak: everything you ever wanted to know about what to say and how to say it; or being militant the smart way. Chapter 1 pinpoints the type of education that is needed, supported by authorities' findings, a challenging blend of the cognitive and affective domain; chapter 2 states what to tell the opposition, from hard core statistics (in 1972, 17% of dropouts were gifted) to suggestions such as "be on the offensive without being offensive" (p.12); chapter 3 proposes working with the establishment rather than wasting energy telling each other horror stories; chapter 4 lists options for the gifted, from Saturday classes to mentors; chapter 5 gives practical hints that convince one that the authors have "been there". The epilogue considers friendly persuasion, commitment that binds. The handbook is must reading for parents and parent groups.

Colangelo, N., & Dettman, D. F. (1983). A review of research on parents and families of gifted children. Exceptional

Children, 5(1), 20-27.

This is an impressive review and synthesis of research in the area, with over 25 studies cited. Characteristics of "gifted" families: they encourage outside interests, allow choice of friends, and the fathers are permissive.

Problems with the gifted arise when (1) child-rearing behavior is derived from a strictly "normal" model, (2) parents feel threatened by the child's abilities, (3) they see the child as a step to upward mobility, and (4) there are nongifted siblings. The literature points to parents as a source of underachievement in the child if (1) they are nonacceptant (this gives a low self-concept), (2) they pressure, (3) there are family difficulties, (4) they overlook signs of giftedness, or (5) they expect giftedness in all areas. Useful parenting ideas are listed.

Colangelo, N., & Kelly, K. R. (1983). A study of student, parent, and teacher attitudes toward gifted programs and gifted students. Gifted Child Quarterly, 27(3), 107-110. Previous research is discussed: the gifted are sometimes rejected by peers, and sometimes the peers are indifferent. This study was of six rural Iowa community schools at the junior high level, where there had been a gifted program for seven years. None of the subjects knew

that they were concentrating on the gifted program; it was just another academic option on the questionnaire. They found that the gifted considered the program important; the parents did also. Peer rejection was not supported. The authors make two interesting suggestions: (1) parents should not be afraid of peer rejection, and should concentrate on peer acceptance, the peers being the other gifted, (2) the fact that this was an established program probably explained the lack of positive or negative reaction; since new programs elicit extreme opinions, one should wait for the excitement to die down before studying attitudes.

Coleman, D. (1982). Parenting the gifted: is this a job for superparent? G/C/I, 48(22), 47-50.

The author sent 50 questionnaires to parents of the children in her gifted resource room. She got 80% of them back. Respondents did not observe that the child affected their family life significantly except for the fact that the child "talked back" a lot. Parenting suggestions are then made, such as allowing a child to fall in love with a field rather than forcing affection for it.

Cornell, D. G. (1983). Gifted children: the impact of positive labeling on the family system. American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 53(2), 322-335.

The complexity of family relationships are shown to be made more so by the presence of one or more gifted children. Cornell makes a quick review of the literature, then concentrates on labeling and its effects. Twenty-two families with one or more gifted were chosen; twenty control families were matched for social class. Neither was told that the researcher was looking for labeling effects. The interviewers were trained to over 80% agreement. The results were significant beyond .10. Major findings were that nongifted siblings are less well-adjusted (several of them had equivalent IQ's). There is a hierarchy in a family with only one gifted: the gifted first, then the mother, the nongifted, and finally the father; with two gifted, there are no status levels. The author suggests that idealization of giftedness may serve purposes such as avoiding interpersonal conflict, structuring relationships within the family, or deriving vicarious glory; if one parent did not see the gifted one as such, it caused marital tension.

Deakin, M. (1972). The children on the hill. London: Andre Deutch.

An interesting, sometimes poignantly gripping portrayal of different parents raising different children, in an isolated part of Wales. The basic assumption is that

readiness for each learning experience is a fleeting occurrence that may only happen once in a child's life. The parent or teacher must be there to advance the process or the chance is lost forever. The mother lives to teach her children, spending every one of their waking moments with them, protecting them from outside "contamination," and doing any housework at night. Genius is produced, but one wonders at what cost to the parents, and maybe to the children themselves. Assuming the desirability of fitting into society, will they become the misfits their parents are?

Delisle, J. (1982). Learning to underachieve. Roeper Review, 4(4), 16-18.

Interesting distinctions are suggested to avert underachievement, where a gifted perfectionist may want to be the worst rather than the best. One should pull, not push (accelerate or relax, listening to the student's knowledge of himself or herself); make risks, not take them (parent as spectator, not pushing to initiate performance); encourage, not praise (creates dependence on the praise instead of task satisfaction).

Delp, J. L., & Martinson, R. A. (1975). The gifted and talented: a handbook for parents. Ventura, California: Ventura County Superintendent of Schools.

This handbook was written in rebellion to the "band-aid" approach; the authors want full-time, qualitatively different education for the gifted, since these number one to one-and-one-half million in the U.S.A. (they consider only the top two to three per cent). A comprehensive list of gifted characteristics is included, along with their concomitant problems. Some references to studies on genius are added, along with statistics on the gifted. A parent questionnaire (voluntary, 64 returned out of 100) was sent out: over half of the children suffered from boredom, and one quarter did not like school. Many of the parents were teachers or in related fields. Good background reading.

Dirks, J. (1979). Parent's reactions to identification of the gifted. Roeper Review, 2(2), 9-10.

Dirks interviewed 21 mothers of identified gifted children (WISC 120 and up) and compared them to a control group of 19 (WISC 90-109). Initially, they reacted favorably to the assessment, then felt doubt, confusion over future schooling, and distress when the child was not perfect in all areas; about half of them prodded the child or the teacher to do more. Counseling and information services are advocated.

Domino, G. (1979). Creativity and the home environment.

Gifted Child Quarterly, 23(4), 818-827.

The mothers of 86 highly creative and less creative boys were studied through 150-question semi-structured interviews. One hundred and thirty-nine children were teacher nominated according to MacKinnon's criteria; they were given a battery of seven creativity measures. The upper quartile were retained, as were the lower quartile. Creative parents had their own creative activities (often artistic), placed no great importance on "creative" materials in the home; mothers provided more encouragement, accepted regressive behavior, and allowed more independence and flexibility.

Dunn, H. C. (1970). A study of parental attitudes concerning a program for academically gifted children. Dissertation Abstracts International, 30A(11), 4678-4679.

Parents of 489 gifted students in the Peoria area were given a Likert-type questionnaire. Rate of return was 91.8%. The Kuder-Richardson formula 20 gave .90 reliability, and the author used complex analysis of variance on each of seven factor clusters. Parents overwhelmingly (92%) endorsed the program, and were least favorable to its operational aspects (transportation, location, etc.). Sex and socio-economic level were unrelated to attitudes.

Ehrlich, V. E. (1982). Gifted children. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall.

The author is both mother of a gifted child and a professional in the field. Her work blends the practical and the theoretical. It contains extensive checklists and tables of traits, myths concerning the gifted, clarification on parent and teacher roles, even career education for the gifted, all treated with conciseness and precision. Suggested readings plus additional information such as available periodicals, psychological services, and the 1978 Children's Education Act, are included. This book contains the facts that parents of the gifted should know before their child enters the classroom for the first time.

Fine, M. J. (1977). Facilitating parent-child relationships for creativity. Gifted Child Quarterly, 21(4), 487-500.

This is a well documented article that supports its statements with research findings. Underachievers often have low self-esteem, skill deficiencies, lag in motor development; they provoke rejection by antisocial behavior, use verbal reasoning to deflect attempts at change, and are caught in familial or parent/school conflicts. Parents and teachers may unknowingly reinforce the underachievement. Suggestions include school

cooperation, group meetings where problems will probably surface for identification, and a strong "good parent" structure.

Fisher, E. (1978). An investigation into the effects of positive labeling on the families of gifted children. Dissertation Abstracts International, 39,6-A, 3317-3318. This study showed that parents' conceptions of giftedness determined their reaction to the term. Six families with identified gifted children were chosen. If the parents did not see the child as gifted, the label was a burden. Disruption occurred when there were nongifted siblings, whether the label came from parents or school. If both parents and school saw the child as gifted, (1) this justified extra demands on the school, (2) parents increased demands on the child, and (3) there was more parental tolerance for unusual behavior or requests. Two couples labeled the child themselves, though the school did not agree. The small sample size and questioning technique (self-reporting by both parents and teachers) limit generalizability.

Frerman, J. (1976). Social factors in aesthetic talent.

Research in Education, 17, 63-76.

Twelve musically talented and twelve artistic children were chosen on the basis of their performance, and matched

with a control group for age, sex, socio-economic level, school achievement, and IQ. The talented students had more parental encouragement in their fields, a larger number of materials were available (musical instruments, books, art equipment), and families were more democratic.

Freeman, J. (1979). Gifted children. Lancaster, England: MTP.

A medical model of giftedness is introduced. The bright are abnormal; the treatment is appropriate education. Gifted girls and lower class gifted are discussed in detail; extensive research is cited proving the effects of parenting on self-image, personal adjustment, and subsequent achievement. Before elaborating her own study, the author examines problems of selection, design, and interpretation, cautioning the reader against faulty conclusions. Three groups were used, consisting of 70 children each, from ages 5-14; one was gifted as identified by parents, who were NAGC members; one was an unidentified gifted control group; one was a control matched for age and sex. Children were tested on the Raven's Progressive Matrices and on the Stanford Binet. Questionnaires and personality measures (variants on Cattell and Cattell, 1973) were given for each of the many variables. Among the numerous findings were traits of the gifted, and the fact that giftedness does not imply

emotional maladjustment. This is carefully done research; an annotation cannot do it justice.

Freeman, J. (1983). Emotional problems of the gifted child. Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry and Allied Disciplines, 24(3), 481-485.

The article contains an abridged version of Freeman's experiment with parent-identified gifted, nonidentified gifted, and a control group. The parent nominated group was significantly (at the 1% level) more disturbed. Problems may stem from heightened sensitivity, unreal expectations related to parental pressure, and gender (boys are more often in this position); curriculum, teaching style (needing permission to advance), and classmates' insensitivity to the intellectual may also be trouble areas. The author concludes by stating that gifted children's particular needs may be met by a more child-centered approach.

French, J. L., & Murphy, J. P. (1983). Parenting of gifted children: a two-edged sword. Roeper Review, 5(3), 36-37. A parent must (1) watch for different developmental rates in various areas, (2) contribute to a healthy self-concept, (3) be an advocate for the child, and (4) not entertain stereotyped views. We are not hearing anything that has not been heard before.

Gallagher, J. J. (1975). Teaching the gifted child (2nd ed.). Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

A background reading book aimed generally at teachers, but containing useful sections for parents, particularly those dealing with identification of the gifted, and those concerning underachievers, culturally different gifted, gifted girls, and the creatively gifted.

Gensley, J. T. (1977). Parent perspective. Gifted Child Quarterly, 21(4), 448-449.

An eye-opener on anxiety that appears to be drawn from the author's experience. It is defined with quotes such as "I hate to go -" and "I've always been afraid of -"; it can be transmitted by overprotection, tension, or sarcasm. Insidious messages can unknowingly be passed on to children and create paralysis of ability in them.

Getzels, J. W., & Jackson, P. W. (1961). Family environment and cognitive style: a study of the sources of highly intelligent and of highly creative adolescents. American Sociological Review, 26(3), 351-359.

This study shows that types of cognition (in this case convergence and divergence), are shaped by family environment. The authors warn against misinterpretation or overgeneralization. There are no good parents or bad parents, and specialized knowledge in parents does not

necessarily lead to high IQ children. The study examines 449 midwest adolescents in private school, at the secondary level. Standard IQ tests as well as creativity measures (Guilford and Cattell adaptations) were administered. Although the high creatives were lower in IQ, (mean 127 vs. 159, range 108-138 vs. 139-179) they achieved as well but were not well liked by teachers. They showed more humor and made more unconventional career choices (62% vs. 16%). Parental differences were striking. The high IQ parents showed more emphasis on money (insecurity stemming from poor childhoods), were more critical (of the school and in general), showed less misgivings about child-rearing (more categorical, vigilant about "correct" upbringing), and wanted exterior values in children's friends (religious, intelligent, cultivated vs openness, balance, sense of values).

Gogel, E. M., & McCumsey, J. M. (1980). Parenting the gifted: an in-service model. Cedar Falls, Iowa: Area Education Agency 7.

This is a compilation of four in-service sessions given to parents during the school year, that dealt with (1) identification of the gifted, (2) how to help them, and (3) emotional consequences of giftedness. Key points from the presentations include giving mental assignments to

these children (they are already buried in paperwork), and teaching the gifted to accept possible failure. Also included are speech-writing for parents about to speak in the community, questions raised by attending parents, and biographies written by parents about their child. The appendix has handouts on identification, forming parent groups, and mentorship programs.

Greenham, D. R. (1978). A study of attitudes about and perceptions of a special program for gifted students. Dissertation Abstracts International, 38, 12-A, 7111-7112. Questionnaires were sent to teachers, parents, administrators, and students participating in a gifted program to test if (1) the program was seen as advantageous, (2) they would they send their own child, and (3) they would see a foreign language adjunct positively. All data were subjected to a one-way analysis of variance, then tested to see which component caused the difference. The three hypotheses were supported. Other findings: (1) parents did not necessarily see the program as prestigious but the other groups did; (2) all but administrators viewed isolation as a problem; (3) teachers of the gifted thought regular teachers saw them negatively, but the regular teachers did not agree that they did so.

Groth, N. J. (1974). The relationship of the affective needs of a sample of intellectually gifted adults to their age, sex, and perceptions of emotional warmth to their parents. Dissertation Abstracts International, 35, 1-A, 286.

An adjective checklist and a questionnaire were given to the Los Angeles chapter of Mensa: 128 women and 104 men. Tests for significance were done. The women differed on intraception, achievement exhibition, and succorance. Need profiles were different for men and women, the women particularly after forty. Remembered warmth of parents was related to different patterns of needs. Same-sex parents had more impact on need development. Somehow, she has not told us anything new.

Groth, N. J. (1975). Mothers of the gifted. Gifted Child Quarterly, 19(3), 217-222.

The author used three null hypotheses, many statistics, and 600 questionnaires, 360 of which were returned, 240 by mothers of children in the top two per cent on the Stanford Binet or Wechsler. The sampling was in the Los Angeles region. These women felt good about themselves, had small families, almost half had bachelor's degrees (at the time, the national norm was 7.2%), two thirds were housewives, though the gifted ones were likely to have careers; the divorce rate was eight per cent.

Hackney, H. (1981). The gifted child, the family and the school. Gifted Child Quarterly, 25(2), 51-54.

The family and school are social systems that interact through the child. The 1980 Purdue University gifted program was examined: not all saw it positively because of the obligations and effects of giftedness. Family roles were altered; sometimes the gifted one even became a third parent. It shaped lifestyle in that parents felt an obligation to provide the best education possible. The role of counselor as mediator and communication facilitator becomes necessary in this context.

Hurley, J. R. (1965). Parental acceptance-rejection and children's intelligence. Merrill-Palmer Review, 11(1), 19-31.

The author used a mailed questionnaire and an interview for parent opinion on discipline and got back 20% of them, i.e., 143 out of 695 parents of the third graders in rural upstate New York. Children were tested on the California Test of Mental Maturity, which correlates highly with the WISC. Findings were significant beyond the .05 level and suggest that parental acceptance-rejection may account for more than a 30% variance in the IQ scores of eight-year-old girls; furthermore, rejection correlates positively with low socio-economic status.

Kaufmann, F. (1976). Your gifted child and you. Reston, Virginia: Council for Exceptional Children.

This how-to manual has parents doing Parnes' creative problem solving and Eberle's SCAMPER with their children: "creativity can be hard work, but it can also bring happiness and productivity" (p.20). It includes a section of forgettable quotes from parent interviews: "emphasize to him that a little conformity at times will be to his advantage" (p.32), and "we have to import gifted children from other neighborhoods" (p.32). It ends by strongly suggesting the organization of your own parent group. This is low priority reading.

Kranz, B. (1982). Reach, touch, and parent. G/C/I, 48(23), 217-222.

The author brilliantly uses psychological criteria to develop practical strategies in raising the gifted, who are so sensitive to inconsistencies. She advocates throwing out differential gifted education within the family: it can be a "normally crazy" family that takes risks, is flexible, and is willing to stand up for itself. "We should not imagine that because sex, politics or money cause an imbalance in the family's structure that it needs to have a catastrophic conclusion" (p.13). She warns against triangles (parents vs. child, etc.), myths

(separation is dangerous, there is never enough money, if he is so bright why does he need help), and underlines the fact that families can give the gifted courage to be imperfect.

LeMahieu, B. (1980). Synthesis of research on the gifted.

Educational Leadership, 38(3), 261-265.

The author gives us an overview of the field in one easy lesson. He discusses various definitions and models of giftedness (SOI, creativity models such as Taylor's or Parnes' and developmental stage models). Bruner's theories are seen as seminal to the emergence of a "qualitatively different" current of the 60's, when Treffinger's self-directed learning, Renzulli's enrichment triad, and acceleration became fashionable. Misuse or rigid uses of Bloom's taxonomy and Guilford's SOI are noted. LeMahieu concludes by affirming every human being's right to the development of his or her potential; this can only be done through scheduling flexibility, grouping variety, and setting diversity. The article ends with a long and complete reference list.

Lundy, J. R. (1978). The psychological needs of the gifted.

Roeper Review, 1(2), 5-8.

The gifted have unique psychological needs: inner states, acquired by learning, that induce behavior, and are not

directly related to maintenance of biological integrity. If these are not met, the individual may become fixated, his energy will not be used for other things and will atrophy. A discussion of Maslow follows, with concrete ideas for overcoming problems in the gifted at each level: (1) physiology, managing the anger response; it is easy to be trapped into hurting one's self by expressing anger through failure to perform, (2) safety, managing the helplessness response; gifted is different and the child will feel it, (3) belonging and love, managing the xenophobic response; the gifted will feel that the others are strange and vice-versa, (4) esteem, they must find ways of being both productive and socially acceptable, (5) self-actualization, effective play, the feeling of creative achievement.

Maddux, C. D., Sherber, L. M., & Bass, J. E. (1982).

Self-concept and social distance in gifted children.

Gifted Child Quarterly, 26(2), 77-81.

This study proves that ability grouping for the gifted is not positive or negative; it is neutral, in relation to their self-concept. This is supported by other cited research. Fifth and sixth graders in an anglo middle-class suburban Texas area were given the Piers-Harris Children's Self-Concept Test and a peer acceptance questionnaire.

Fifty-five segregated gifted, 55 control, and 55 nonidentified gifted were studied. In the sixth grade, there were nonsignificant differences in self-concept, slightly favoring the segregated group, which was in its second year of the program. The fifth grade was a bit higher in social distance; the authors state that it may be because they are in their first year of segregation.

Malone, C. E. (1975) Education for parents of the gifted.

Gifted Child Quarterly, 19, 223-225.

Malone advocates education and counseling for parents of gifted children. A questionnaire was filled out by 55 parents in her parent education class: ten knew their own IQ, 15 felt gifted, 18 felt their spouse was gifted, 12 felt that neither they nor their spouse was gifted; 41 children were identified by the school, and nine were judged gifted by parents as preschoolers. In a second survey, half of the parents thought an IQ test gave the child's true ability; characteristics most observed were inquisitiveness, sensitivity, persistence, confidence, and communicativeness. Parents expressed the need for counseling, and knowledge of teaching methods so as to fill in for lacks at school.

Malone, C. E. (1976). Parents as facilitators of talent in the arts. Gifted Child Quarterly, 20(4), 447-450.

An unexceptional article stating that extent of involvement in the arts is determined by childhood influences. Four developmental stages are given: (1) awareness, (2) interest, (3) skill development, and (4) creation. Parents are exhorted to be sympathetic when the hard work level is reached.

Miller, A. Prisoners of childhood. New York: Basic Books.

This is the extreme of what can be done to a human being (particularly a gifted one) by parents, if they themselves are in need of therapy. Alice Miller carefully pulls us along the route taken from the basement of narcissistic disturbance to adult self-awareness. The process begins when a past child/adult relationship is too painful to be faced; it is neurotically avoided, either through depression or grandiosity (blowing one's horn madly from achievement to achievement). A child's giftedness may cause problems if the parents feel cowered by it, competitive toward it, or live vicariously through it. This is a good companion volume to D. Willings' The Creatively Gifted, which explores the disturbed creatives.

Miller, B. S., & Price, M. (1981). The gifted child, the family, and the community. New York: Walker.

This pot-pourri of 33 essays gives an overview of giftedness, with particular emphasis on family and

community. After dealing with identification, it focuses on the pitfalls and opportunities of parents, and displays wide ranges of schooling that can be chosen, from parent group activities to summer schools and mentorship programs. Finally, available career options are covered, including business, thearts, and the possibility that college is not for all.

Newland, E. T. (1976). The gifted in socio-educational perspective. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall.

Newland views the gifted as those at the higher levels of potential or achievement in various areas that are needed to keep society functioning. He also insists that each child has the right to an appropriate education that will bring him self-fulfillment. Identification, underachievement, problems of those of above 140-160 IQ, rural and disadvantaged gifted, even administrative or instructional considerations are elaborated. Finally, we are advised in evaluating works in the field. This is arid reading, but well worth the effort.

Nichols, R. C. (1964). Parental attitudes of mothers of intelligent adolescents and creativity of their children. Child Development, 35, 1041-1049.

Childrearing attitudes of the mothers of 796 male and 450 female high-ability high school seniors were assessed

using the Parental Attitudes Research Instrument: inventories were mailed and 83% returned. The students were given inventories, scales, self-ratings and activity checklists. Authoritarianism in the mother correlated positively with academic performance, and negatively with creativity.

Pal, H. I. (1979). Child-rearing practices and locus of control in gifted adolescents. Dissertation Abstracts International, 39, 7-A, 4184-4185.

Internal locus of control (and attendant high performance) is linked with parental training for intellectual achievement, responsibility, and deferred gratification, under five optimal learning conditions of warmth, consistent discipline, role modeling, rationality, and flexibility. Fifty parents were interviewed, and their children were given Rotter's Internal External Locus of Control scale. The student sampling was controlled for socio-economic status, IQ, age, and sex.

Parker, M., Ross, A., & Deutch, R. (1980). Parenting the gifted adolescent. Roeper Review, 2(4), 40-42.

Research on the gifted is used to support androgynous and democratic parenting: the authors point to the need for effective relationship skills, and state that conformity to parental values is achieved with shared decisions and

explanations, i.e., democracy.

Perino, S. C., & Perino, J. Parenting the gifted. New York:
R. R. Bowker.

Two psychologists have written a guide that somehow "speaks down" to parents; they hope it will help them look at the child from a "new and different" perspective. After an overview of various IQ tests, we are told that we may feel confused. Four teaching models of the gifted are discussed: Bloom, Guilford, Williams, and Renzulli, as are the gifted disadvantaged (women are included here). This work is well written, yet one feels that the authors must not think gifted children have gifted parents.

Peterson, D. C. (1977). The heterogeneously gifted family. Gifted Child Quarterly, 21(3), 396-411.

Child-rearing suggestions are given, in ways one may not have thought of. For instance, in a family where not all are gifted, Peterson advises seeking out the bright one and talking of separate activities beforehand. This is not considered secretive; it is just being discreet.

Creativity can be stimulated (1) by providing a warm psychological base and (2) through social relationships (valuing differentness, living Krathwohl and Bloom). She describes the creativity cycle's active and depressed phases: "creative youth needs personal evaluation and love

after its exertions" (p.407). The essence is that there is a place for all in the world.

Rimm, S. (1984). Underachievement . . . or if God had meant gifted children to run our homes, She would have created them bigger. G/C/I, 31, 26-29.

A psychological view of underachievement is given. It is learned and can thus be unlearned; contributing factors are often in the home, and must be identified to be changed. It is often initiated by such things as sibling rivalry, a marriage problem, or an early illness. It is then continued because of ritualistic roles taken on by family members. Identification with either same-sex or opposite-sex parent ("father is a dummy" or "mommy is an ogre"), counteridentification, where a parent identifies with one child and invests time or shares skills yet may pressure too much, considering the child an adult because of his advanced characteristics, and following instead of guiding. These are traps that parents of the gifted need to be aware of.

Rowlands, P. (1974). Gifted children and their problems.

London: Dent.

Peter Rowlands divides the gifted into two types: the convergent (high IQ), and the divergent (high creative), the latter being the problem-prone variety. Bright

the latter being the problem-prone variety. Bright children are handicapped by their ability if they are bound by traditionnal school routine or by parents that do not allow the development of natural talents. He makes some reference to Piaget, pointing out with specific cases that formal operations happen faster in the gifted, who should nontheless not be stereotyped, for it would bring self-concept, sibling, or peer problems. Parents' participation in gifted organizations is suggested so that they can gain support from each other and knowledge of the true meaning of giftedness.

Schwartz, L. L. (1981). Are you a gifted parent of a gifted child? Gifted Child Quarterly, 25(1), 31-35.

Parents are entreated to see their gifted child as a challenge. Relevant skills are needed to meet it, in each of seven areas discussed by the writer: (1)handling questions, (2)developing physical and social skills, (3)teaching decision-making, (4)encouraging activities, (5)being a model, (6)facing giftedness (and effacing stereotypes), (7)enhancing family relationships. This is a comprehensive discussion of the usual hazards involved in raising a gifted child.

Sebring, A. D. (1983). Parental factors in the social and emotional adjustment of the gifted. Roeper Review, 6(2),

97-99.

Today's generation of aware and informed parents may well give rise to new problems in raising their gifted children. They can overextend themselves physically and financially to provide an education appropriate to the high potential, leading to possibilities for guilt feelings in a child who absolutely must perform to justify all this. Parents may also compensate for less ability in one or more siblings by giving them more attention; the gifted one could then feel rejected. The article ends with some standard parenting prescriptions.

Siegelbaum, L., & Rotner, S. (1983). Ideas and activities for parents of preschool gifted children. G/C/I, 26, 40-44.

The content of the article is explained in its title. I somehow felt that the authors did not think the children could do it on their own; that the gifted need to be taught to make assumptions, for example, as if they do not themselves ask "what will happen next?" and propose innumerable possibilities. Aside from this reservation, the ideas are acceptable; activities are given for the creatively gifted (make a magic toy, make a recipe); for advanced readers (write word cards, a book); for the advanced mathematical (telling time, doing puzzles); and for the exceptionally bright (compare, contrast, group).

Tabackman, M. J. (1977). A study of family psycho-social environment, and its relationship to academic achievement in gifted adolescents. Dissertation Abstracts International, 37, 10-A, 6381.

This study was done on 110 families in an Urbanna, Illinois school for superior students; 154 parents did the Family Environmental Scale Form R (perception), and the 127 students, who were from 12 to 18 years, did Form I (measure of the ideal family). Achievement was the percentile rank within each grade level. Families of achievers saw themselves as more independent, permissive, intellectual, unstructured, and harmonious. Achievers considered the ideal family to be more child-centered than their own, more supportive, and having more recreational activities; they saw their family as conflict-free, saw themselves as less communicative and active socially; there was congruence with parents' perceptions and real-ideal congruence. A stepwise multiple regression analysis was done to isolate the independent contributions of IQ, sex, grade level, and ethnicity. Verbal IQ was higher in high achievers and they tended to be female. There was no differentiation because of grade or ethnicity.

Tackas, C. (1982). They don't get gifted until the fourth

grade-- what parents can do in the meantime. Roeper Review, 4(4), 43-45.

It is quite rightly pointed out that less than ten per cent of all gifted programs include kindergarten or grade one, yet research shows that debilitating perfectionism (among other problems) takes root between the ages of two and seven, when a child moves from private to public life (home to school). The gifted are different in three areas: the cognitive, psychosocial, and physical (energy level). Suggestions are given in each area.

Thiel, R., & Thiel, A. F. (1977). A structural analysis of family interaction patterns and the underachieving gifted child. Gifted Child Quarterly, 21(2), 267-275.

The authors review the literature. Parents are often a cause of underachievement because of (1)rejecting the child, (2)pressuring, (3)setting unfavorable family goals (lower classes often do not see the importance of learning), (4)emotional problems which do not allow the acceptance and trust which is necessary for self-esteem. There seem to be more male underachievers. Three male cases were studied using a triangular model of interaction (mother, father, child). Notably, both mother and son had a poor self-concept.

Tremaine, C. D. (1979). Do gifted programs make a difference?

Gifted Child Quarterly, 23(3), 500-517.

Sixty students enrolled in a gifted program and forty unenrolled gifted were compared. Grade point average of the enrolled was five points higher, and more of them planned college attendance; they had more extra-curricular activities and a higher regard for school. There was no evidence of snobbishness when questioned about their peers.

Vail, P. (1979). The world of the gifted child.

Harmondsworth, England: Penguin.

The author starts off by outright rejection of acceleration in spite of much research to the contrary, which she does not mention. She suggests that we discard the term gifted and replace it with "steamers" since this does not insult those who do not steam. The types of giftedness identified by the Marland Report are listed; she incorrectly points out that underachievers would not be included. Her substitute identification criteria are (1)recognition, rather than learning of new material, (2)noticing patterns, (3)energy level, (4)curiosity, (5)drive and concentration, (6)memory, (7)empathy, (8)heightened perceptions, (9)invulnerability in some field, (10)divergent thinking. The chapter on learning disabled uses striking examples; one lives their

frustration. Extensive ideas for children's books and activities are given; we are warned about "gifted" toys and curriculum materials. This book is very readable but gets mired in emotional examples, though one must agree that no one child is like any other. Priscilla Vail idealizes the gifted. Already over-emotional parents, beware!

Webb, J. T., Meckstroth, E. A., & Tolan, S. (1982). Guiding the gifted child. Columbus, Ohio: Ohio Publishing.

The authors have assembled a collage of ideas (supported by findings from research), recommended readings, and quotes, peppered with good common sense. Considerable importance is placed on emotional development. They cover depression, suicide, sibling rivalry, stress, underachievement, and other problems that may afflict the gifted more and differently than other children because of (1) more acute sensibilities, (2) faster development (may have to deal with some dilemmas at a younger age), and (3) giftedness (and all that implies). Each chapter has a "most commonly asked questions" section. They did not choose the easier ones! Finally, a book for parents and teachers that goes beyond being a how-to guide; the gifted child is seen as a self, not an assortment of "gifts". This book won an award from the American Psychological

Association.

Wellings, C. R., & Crase, S. J. (1979). Parental influence on creativity of fifth grade children. Gifted Child Quarterly, 23(4), 768-775.

Sixty-five children and 121 parents were given the Torrance Tests of Creative Thinking. There was no significant correlation between the children and their mothers, but there was one with their fathers. The authors warn us to be conservative in our conclusions.

Whitmore, J. (1980). Giftedness, conflict, and underachievement. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

An overview of literature and research on the area is given. Underachieving gifted are divided into four types: the learning disabled, the behaviorally disordered, the neurologically handicapped, and the paralyzed perfectionist. They have an exceptional capacity to solve their problems with good guidance. Family interaction patterns are cited as major contributing causes, and research brought in as proof. The author then describes her experiment, the Cupertino Underachieving Gifted project, behavioral change brought about in the classroom through the reality approach. The experimental group consisted of 29 students, compared to a class of bright achievers on the Sears Self-Concept Inventory, the

Intellectual Achievement Responsibility Inventory, standardized achievement tests, and daily progress reports. Results were positive. Limitations are mentioned: student mobility, atypicality of sampling, and low funding. This book is not specifically for parents, but can be invaluable for them in identifying possible achievement problems, and in using strategies to modify them.

Willings, D. (1980). The Creatively Gifted. Cambridge: Woodland-Faulkner.

A creative work on the creatively gifted: it is interspersed with case histories illustrating Willings' three types of creatives: the adaptive, the elaborative, and the developmental. He refers to much research, notably that on the link between verbal giftedness and creativity, then overviews parents, schools, and society, showing why creative potential is not only frustrated, but actually denied, in spite of what he calls the pseudo-creative trends of today (practice this exercise and you will be creative). Continued counseling is recommended for these individuals who have so much to offer, if only they were allowed to give it.

Zorman, R. (1982). Parents do make a difference. Roeper Review, 5(2), 41-43.

Additional references

- Aldous, J. (1973). Family background factors and originality in children. Gifted Child Quarterly, 17(3), 183-192.
- Chen, A. (1980). Social development in gifted children. Roeper Review, 3, 42-44.
- Cornell, D. G. (1981). Families of gifted children. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Michigan.
- Fine, M. J., & Pitts, R. (1980). Intervention with underachieving gifted children: rationale and strategies. Gifted Child Quarterly, 24, 51-55.
- Flowers, J. V., Horsman, J., & Schwartz, B. (1982). Raising your gifted child. Eaglewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice Hall.
- Ford, B. (1978). Student attitudes toward special programming and identification. Gifted Child Quarterly, 22(4), 489-497.
- Gallagher, J. J. (Ed.) (1979). The gifted children: reaching their potential. New York: Trillium.
- Green, B. (1982). Your child is bright. New York: St. Martin's.
- Groth, N. J. (1971). Differences in parental environment needed for degree achievement for gifted men and women. Gifted Child Quarterly, 15(4), 256-261.
- Khatena, J. (1978). The creatively gifted child: suggestions

- for parents and teachers. New York: Vantage.
- Kramer, A. H. (Ed.) (1981). Gifted children, challenging their potential. New York: Trillium.
- Malone, C. E. (1976). Parents as facilitators of talent in the arts. Gifted Child Quarterly, 20(4), 447-450.
- Marion, R. (1980). Communicating with parents of culturally diverse children. Exceptional Children, 46(8), 616-623.
- Shore, B. M., Gagne, F., Larivee, S., Tali, R. H., & Tremblay, R. E. (Eds.) (1983). Face to face with giftedness. New York: Trillium.
- Strang, R. (1960). Helping your gifted child. New York: Dutton.